



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,551	02/25/2002	Szeming Cheng	9432-000172	3149

27572 7590 10/03/2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,551

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL

Examiner

Matthew Heneghan

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/13/02
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

AT

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-13 have been examined.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The following Information Disclosure Statement in the instant application has been fully considered:

IDS filed 13 June 2002.

#### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to because on paragraph 19, line 1 of the specification references non-existent figure 2. It is being presumed this refers to figure 2A.
4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: item "50" in paragraph 24.

Art Unit: 2134

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: figure 2A, item 46.

6. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "perceptually significant" in claim 3 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "perceptually significant" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. For purposes of the prior art search, any transform parameters are considered to teach to claim 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kang et al., "Reliable watermark detection method based on analysis of correlation," Optical Engineering, December, 2000, pp 3308-3316.

As per claims 1 and 3, Kang discloses the using of a transformed signal (see Section 2, first paragraph), the modification of the transform parameters to reduce the variance by removing the  $\mu_x$  value (see p. 3310), and a watermark is added (see algorithm starting at the end of p. 3311 through the end of p. 3312, first column).

As per claim 4, the watermark signal is received and incorporated with a white noise source (i.e. pseudo-random numbers), producing  $r(i)$  (see Section 2, first paragraph), which is to be combined with the difference values from the combined sequence in the algorithm (see figure 4 and algorithm at beginning of p. 3312, second column).

As per claim 5, the watermark signal is meant to be applied to multimedia data (see Section 1), which inherently comprises video and audio data.

As per claim 6, the transform domain may be discrete cosine, discrete (fast) fourier, or discrete wavelet transform (see Section 2, first paragraph).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claims 7-13 are allowed.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claims 2, 7, and 13, though the prior art discloses the mapping of differences between pairs of consecutive host frequency coefficients ("phase coding") in

Art Unit: 2134

the context of watermarking (see Bender et al., "Techniques for Data hiding", IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 35, Nos. 3&4, 1996.) and the use of alternating signs in transform values (see Cheng et al., "An Additive Approach to Transform-Domain Information Hiding and Optimum Detection Structure," IEEE Transactions on Multimedia, Vol. 3, pp. 273-284, September 2001.), no art could be found that suggested the placing of the coefficients in ascending or descending order in the context of a watermarking application. U.S. Patent No. 6,483,927 to Brunk et al. discloses the sorting of coefficients, but no motivation could be found for combining it with the other cited art to establish obviousness.

Claims 8-10 are disclosed by Bender, but are allowable based upon their dependence upon claim 7.

Claim 11 expounds upon the sorting of claim 7 and is therefore also allowable.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,608,911 to Lofgren et al. discloses the encoding of watermarks in antipodal form.

U.S. Patent No. 6,650,762 to Gibson et al. the framing of codewords in a watermarking scheme.

Art Unit: 2134

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached at (571) 272-3838.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Or faxed to:**

(571) 273-3800

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



GREGORY MORSE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER



Application/Control Number: 10/082,551

Page 8

Art Unit: 2134

MEH *MEH*

September 23, 2005